UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes **Francis Neilson**

The Superstition of Divorce

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

The Era of the Protestant Reformation in England and New England

AN HISTORICAL ANTHOLOGY, PART II

By CHARLES WILLIAM WENDTE

Book Reviews

By SUSAN QUACKENBUSH

Sonnets from Marcus Aurelius, by James Vila Blake

I Believe in God the Father, by John Faville

VOLUME LXXXVI NUMBER 13

Chicago, December 16, 1920

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

ESTABLISHED 1878

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCES L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—
Notes.—J. H. H. 195
The Superstition of Divorce.—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES . . 197

CONTRIBUTED—
The Era of the Protestant Reformation in England and New England, Part II.—CHARLES WILLIAM WENDTE . . 200

SELECTED—
The Kansas Court of Industrial Justice.—*Hon. Henry J. Allen* 202

POETRY—
Hymn—*John Bunyan*, 1678 195
Helps for Courts of Heresy.—*Edwin Markham* 199
To My Friend, William E. Allen.—JAMES WALDO FAWCETT 199
The Fire-fly.—*Agnes Ryan* 205

THE STUDY TABLE—
Book Reviews.—SUSAN QUACKENBUSH 206

THE FIELD—
To the Churches and the Christian People of America.—*Federal Council of Churches* 207
An Appeal to the American People 208

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

Vol. LXXXVI THURSDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1920 Number 13

HYMN.

He that is down need fear no fall,
  He that is low, no pride;
He that is humble ever shall
  Have God to be his guide.

I am content with what I have,
  Little it be or much;
And, Lord, contentment still I crave
  Because Thou savest such.

Fullness to them a burden is
  That go on pilgrimage:
Here little, and hereafter bliss,
  Is best from age to age.

—*John Bunyan*, 1678.

How you can help Unity in this Christmas season! (1) Give a year's subscription to Unity as a Christmas present to your friends; (2) Send us a dollar, for a four months' trial subscription for a friend; (3) subscribe to Unity for your minister, and for the reading table in your church, or your local public library or club; (4) send us an annual money offering, as you do to your church, and to various philanthropic and reform societies; (5) put Unity on sale at your church door after the Sunday services; (6) canvass for new subscriptions. Unity wants to double its circulation this year. It must depend upon its readers to do it. Won't you lend a hand?

The case of the Pacifists against the Great War is now conceded by the New York *World*. This newspaper has for eight years been the chosen mouthpiece of Woodrow Wilson, was an ardent advocate of war in 1917, and sustained the war policy without reservations throughout the continuance of the struggle. Now it admits that the Pacifists were right in their contention that the War was not a conflict for ideals of liberty and democracy, and that America should not have joined forces with the Allies. We were deceived, says the *World*—there was nothing to choose between the two sets of combatants. Or, to use its own words:

> The War that was fought to end war turns out to have been a war in which *one kind of imperialism has been triumphant over another kind of imperialism.*

It is unnecessary to point out in this place that this is just what the Pacifists asserted from the beginning. It may be well to emphasize, however, that it was because the Pacifists insisted upon saying this very thing not when it was safe and innocuous, as now, but when it was dangerous and well worth while, that many of them were jailed, and still at this moment languish in prison. Mr. Debs, for example, is serving his ten years' sentence because he saw two years *before* what the *World* is now seeing two years *after*, and dared to say so! Time, after all, is a great avenger! It was easy for the war-makers, who sacrificed America to the interests of European imperialism, to silence their opponents with espionage laws and draft acts. But they strive in vain to silence the verdict which history is already beginning to write against them.

What an incorrigible people these Greeks are! Here they have repudiated the great Venizelos who bestowed upon them all the glories of war, along with the regrettably unavoidable incidents of death, disease, debt and general woe. And now with one acclaim they welcome back their exiled King, Constantine, who was dethroned by the Allies as a pro-German, because he refused to plunge his subjects into the horrors of a selfish and futile conflict between two competing imperialisms. What are we going to do with such people? Indeed, what are we going to do with people generally? For men and women seem to be acting in much the same way everywhere throughout the world, whenever they get the slightest opportunity. The victors in the Great War, crowned with their laurel wreaths, laden with their booty, are being smitten at the ballot-box as terribly as the hated "Hun" was smitten on the battle field. The people are indeed ungrateful. Why kill them with explosive bombs and poisonous gases, why grind their faces with enormous taxes, why suppress their cherished liberties of speech and action, if in the end they are going to prove so wretchedly ungrateful to those who have thus blessed them? These impudent Greeks are "the last straw." If this sort of thing goes on, it looks as though no premier or president would dare to declare any wars in the future, and as though "peace on earth" might actually become a possibility!

The determination of the American business world to use the present period of industrial depression as an occasion for smashing the trade unions, is being made perfectly plain. The corporations will soon have labor "eating out of their hands," as one of the big magnates openly boasted a few weeks ago. And we suppose that the employers actually believe that in forcing this issue in this terrible way, they are fortifying their position and destroying the enemy! As a matter of fact, like the blind reactionaries of every age, they are hastening on the very revolution which

they most fear. Nothing is so much needed in the industrial world today, from the standpoint at least of radical reform, as the liquidation of the forces of labor. The old-line trade unions have very largely done their work. They stand today as consolidations of the victories of the past, not as armies marching to the victories of the future. They are become static in our time; life and vision and valiant faith are gone out of them forever. To get them out of the way, and thus restore movement forward, is the pressing need today—and it is just this need which the laboring man himself cannot serve. For the trade union is his achievement, and must therefore have his protection. Now come the employers to do this task for him. By smashing the unions, the employers will throw labor back upon itself—liquidate its power, liberate its energy, and force it into new types of organization fitted for the work which must be done today for human emancipation. Let the business world do its worst this forbidding winter. In the long run, it will be "worst" for itself and not for its victims.

The New York theatrical season, which sets the pace for all the rest of the country, seems just a little worse this year than it has ever been before. Crude vulgarity competes with indecency presented in the guise of gorgeous spectacle, and both threaten to be engulfed by the mounting flood of inane futility. The Broadway stage is crowded with women who are actresses only in the sense that they are willing to expose their nakedness to the public gaze, and with men whose only qualifications are the ability to tell a dirty joke in a dirty way. The degenerative influences of the war are nowhere more evident than on the stage. And yet the situation is not wholly discouraging. G. Bernard Shaw's brilliant and important drama, "Heartbreak House," is being played by the Theatre Guild to crowded houses. John Galsworthy's "The Mob" had a phenomenal run at an out-of-the-way playhouse on the East Side; and his "The Skin Game" is one of the season's great and worthy successes. Frank Craven has written a genuine human comedy, full of shrewd observation and kindly humor, in his "The First Year"; and an actor of the first order of creative genius has just been disclosed in Ben-Ami. All this is heartening, especially the evidence that the public is ready to support this kind of work. But what are we to think, on the other hand, when we see this as the whole record of first-class achievement in a city which numbers its theatres by the scores, and its nightly audiences by the hundreds of thousands?

The theatrical profession is much incensed because the Methodist Church has refused to admit actors and actresses into membership. We sympathize with their indignation, for we believe that spiritual fellowship should be denied to no group of persons as a group. Application for membership in any church should be considered as an individual matter, to be decided on the basis of the merit or demerit of the particular person concerned. On the other hand, however, we wonder if the actors and actresses of our time are wholly without blame. Are they not earning their living in the service of an institution which is rapidly sinking to the lowest depths of moral degradation? Are not men and women, supposedly respectable, appearing nightly in plays which outrage every decent instinct of human nature? Are not the members of the profession, in other words, aiding and abetting the debauchery of the commercial managers, by consenting to do for them their dirty work? One cannot touch pitch without being defiled. One cannot act in a disreputable play without oneself coming under suspicion of being a disreputable character. If our players want to be regarded as decent folk, they must refuse to serve as the purveyors of indecencies. Let them refuse to appear in plays which are unworthy of their art and of their self-respect. By so doing, they will save the theatre from the corruption which has now come upon it, and at the same time make it impossible for any people, in or out of church, to refuse them fellowship.

So the Federal Council of Churches is not going to salvage the Inter-church World Movement—for the excellent reason that there is nothing to salvage! The Inter-church is so completely wrecked that it is simply not worth while trying to pick up the pieces. Instead, the Federal Council is to enlarge its work, and try to do sanely what the Inter-church Movement tried to do insanely. It is heartening to see that, at its recent conference in Boston, the Council put to the forefront of its program for the new year the task of breaking down the separation between denominations. "The Council believes," according to one of the planks adopted, "that the time has come for fuller action on its part in the fulfillment of the purpose of its establishment for the prosecution of work that can better be done in union than in separation." In furtherance of this idea, the Council agreed to call a conference of the various agencies which serve the churches co-operatively, "to consider the mutually most helpful working relationships and arrangements." At this same Boston meeting, it is to be noted, that Bishop Talbot of Pennsylvania declared that the Episcopal Church was willing to recognize the Christian ministry of every church on the face of the earth. Thus does the good work of religious unity go on! "Boring from within" and revolt from without are slowly but surely overthrowing the walls of sectarian division.

Further examination of the Unitarian Campaign for $3,000,000, as described in *The Christian Register* for December 2nd, reveals some interesting facts. One of the most inspiring, for those who have this cause deeply at heart, is the fact that two hundred and eight (208) out of the three hundred and thirty (330) churches participating in the "drive," oversubscribed their quota. There is no question that this is fine evidence of enthusiasm, discipline and unity of spirit. We confess to a feeling of dismay, however, at the discovery which we had not made before, that the Campaign was limited to these three hundred and thirty so-called "active parishes." Where are the other parishes commonly rated as making up the grand total of Unitarian churches in this country? In the last "Unitarian Year Book" (1919-1920) we find no less than four hundred and seventy-seven (477) societies named on the official "List of Unitarian Churches in the United States and Canada" (page 102). Eighteen (18) of these churches we find starred as "inactive"; but these eighteen, added to the list of the three hundred and thirty churches in the "drive," leaves one hundred and thirty (130) churches still to be accounted for. This seems to us to be an astounding discrepancy. What does it mean? That the *Year Book* list is dishonest? Not at all! It simply means, we take it, that something like one hundred and thirty of the Unitarian churches of America are like the ancient church in Sardis, of which it was said, "Thou hast a name that thou livest, but art dead." One result of the Campaign seems to be a demonstration of the unhappy fact that the Unitarian denomination is more than one-fourth smaller than it was thought to be.

Is it said that the church today is old-fashioned, unenterprising, unadapted to the modes of the time? Note this advertisement in the columns of the New York newspapers:

MOTOR TO CHURCH ON THE HUDSON
CHRIST CHURCH,

252nd St. and Riverdale Ave.,
New York City.

Twelve miles from 42nd St., in the
beautiful Riverdale section.

Short service every Sunday at 11 a. m.

Try the experiment of reading this notice aloud, omitting the name of the church and the seductive promise of a "short service," and see if those who hear do not describe it as the advertisement of a suburban real estate speculator, or an automobile roadhouse. Enterprising, unquestionably! But what about the ancient idea of the church as an institution of religion?

The Superstition of Divorce

The problem of divorce is always with us—more so than ever since the close of the Great War, and the swift disclosure of the demoralization which it has created. In France, in England, even in America, divorce is on the increase, as an immediate consequence of the lowering of that whole moral standardization of life which had been so successfully wrought through years of painful discipline in the years before 1914. That such a situation constitutes an alarming evil, goes without saying. But we regard it as no more alarming than the frantic reaction now being stirred up on both sides of the Atlantic against the whole institution of divorce. To use an occasion of marital disorder and general sexual laxity as an excuse for declaring all divorce a sin, and all marriage an irrevocable relationship, is nothing more nor less than hysteria. We need a new statement of the case, to save us from the two equally dangerous extremes of servitude and free love.

An excellent opportunity for fresh discussion of this problem, and restatement of what we regard as the basic truths involved, is given by the recent publication of Gilbert K. Chesterton's book entitled "The Superstition of Divorce" (John Lane Company, New York). Mr. Chesterton accurately describes his little volume as "a pamphlet and not a book." The earlier chapters, confessedly "crude and sketchy," appeared originally in the form of five articles in *The New Witness;* to these are added "a few further chapters, explaining more fully any conceptions that may seem to have been too crudely assumed or dismissed." The book is brilliant, witty, superficial, and of course paradoxical. Mr. Chesterton's chief stock in trade is paradoxes, and in this volume he presents a particularly varied if somewhat artificial set of wares. One wonders, however, just what is accomplished by the discussion of such a problem as marriage and divorce in that spirit of jugglery which seems to have become a kind of second nature to G. K. Chesterton. The author, of course, has a glorious holiday, and so in a sense do his readers; but the suggestion that something is being butchered to make this holiday, is unescapable.

We would not indicate, however, that the book is not serious. Behind all the literary handsprings there is a genuine note of conviction. It is this very fact, perhaps, which makes Mr. Chesterton's literary tricks more than ordinarily distasteful. He is discussing one of the most profound, complex and tragic problems of human life, and he seems to feel that he has a message of deep import to convey. It is rather a pity that in discussing this theme he did not realize that, like the marriage ceremony itself, it is "not to be entered into lightly or unadvisedly, but reverently, discreetly, soberly and in the fear of God."

Mr. Chesterton's book, or "pamphlet," is "a stricture on divorce," and therefore a defense of "the ideal of indissoluble or at least undissolved marriage." It is a plea for the perpetuation of "the old monogamous ethic of our civilization," for divorce is here regarded as nothing more nor less than a method of making polygamy respectable. "The definition of divorce," says the author, "is that it is the attempt to give respectability and not liberty." The divorcè is simply the man, or the woman, who seeks to pass lightly from partner to partner in the sexual relation, like the promiscuous savage, and at the same time possess that status of marriage which belongs properly to the highest culture and the truest religion. The undisciplined person would enjoy all the sanctities and avoid all the responsibilities of matrimony. He would have his cake and eat it too. To this Mr. Chesterton strenuously objects. He denies to no man the privilege of living with as many different women as he may desire; a harem is as possible and perhaps as common in London as in Constantinople. What he insists is that "any man in modern London may have a hundred wives if he does not call them wives; or rather, if he does not go through certain more or less mystical ceremonies in order to assert that they are wives." For marriage, to Mr. Chesterton, is an indissoluble relation founded upon the sanctity of the vow. Like love of country, it is to be preserved inviolate even at the bitter price of pain, and failure, and mortal sacrifice. To desert the marriage relation because it brings disaster, is as shameful and fatal a thing as to desert the flag of one's country in the hour of its defeat. Marriage is not an experiment, a holiday jaunt, a week-end excursion. It is a pledge of life allegiance —an allegiance more terrible than that of country because it is a fact not imposed by the accident of birth, but freely assumed by a deliberate act of will. To weaken this pact is to drain life at its source, and undermine that relationship of "voluntary loyalty" between man and man which is the foundation of social order, and "the protection of liberty."

Mr. Chesterton, it should be said, is not blind to "the tragedies of marriage." He describes these, however, as "the price of maintaining an ideal, or the price of making a mistake." The tragedy greater than all tragedies of marriage is the supreme tragedy of divorce. To separation, apparently, he has no objection, for he is humane enough to see that only by separation can some of the tragedies of marriage be endured. What he denounces, and will have nothing of, is separation so arranged legally as to permit remarriage by one or both of the parties involved. "The divorce controversy," he says, "is not really a controversy about divorce. It is a controversy about remarriage." "It is here," he says again, "that we draw the line. . . . The battle joins on (this) debatable ground."

It is to Mr. Chesterton's credit that he recognizes that the ground which he selects for his battle is "debatable." With much that the author has to say about marriage as a relation sanctified by what he very beautifully describes as "the vow," we are in entire agreement. We endorse also his resounding denunciation of the man who takes such a vow with one woman, only to seek release from it, that he may take a similar vow with another woman—"the gentleman who marries as many women as he likes and gets rid of them as often as he pleases." Divorce from one marriage as a mere condition of making a second marriage, is wrong, and we will gladly join with Mr. Chesterton in doing all we can to forbid divorce or remarriage under such circumstances. Where we quarrel and would debate with Mr. Chesterton, is in his contention that the problem of divorce begins or ends with such a situation as he describes. Let us take the "Lothario or Don Juan," in whom Mr. Chesterton sees the divorce issue personified. Let us agree that he must be denied the respectability which he seeks. But what about the wife of this man, who has loved sincerely and lived faithfully? Shall she be doomed forever to a relationship which, however genuine in the beginning, has proved to be a "delusion and a snare"? Must she be bound "till death do us part" to one whom she has learned cannot be loved nor respected, and whose presence is a denial to her of all the sanctities of personal intimacy and devotion which make up the best of life? The very virtue of one partner to a marriage is oftentimes the measure of the outrage visited upon that partner by his mate. In other words, there is innocence involved in the tragedy of a broken marriage as well as guilt. Indeed, it is this innocence which makes the tragedy, and creates for its relief the necessity of divorce.

For such cases Mr. Chesterton seems to think separation (without remarriage) an adequate remedy! Even in the extreme instance of homicidal mania, he argues that "a person should be allowed some sort of release," but that "anybody who has had that experience should be content with that release. . . . He should be content with that experience of matrimony and not seek another." But why? Is there anything so inherently sacrosanct in the bonds of matrimony that they shall never be lifted under any circumstances? Is innocence, betrayed by cruelty, infidelity, homicidal mania, even incompatibility of temper, to be denied another chance of the happy and abundant life? Even patriotism, which Mr. Chesterton seems to think the perfect parallel to marital love, may be transferred from one country to another, as witness our millions of "new Americans." But from

marriage, apparently, there can be no such escape as from one's country! Whatever the disabilities and agonies, these the wedded, innocent and guilty alike, "may honorably be called upon to bear for the glory of their own oath and the great things by which the nations live."

With such doctrine we have no sympathy. We have no use for "eternal punishment" either in this world or in the next. The one great fault and grievous weakness of Mr. Chesterton's argument is his persistent ignoring of this side of the question, his obstinate dooming of human beings to irretrievable consequences for

> . . . . pangs of nature, sins of will,
> Defects of doubt and taints of blood.

Shall there not be "somehow good" as the "final goal" of these ills? Shall not the innocent have escape from outrage and betrayal? And is it not even possible that those who are guilty of weakness, or even sin, shall have opportunity for self-recovery and reconstruction of their lives? We cannot conceive of marriage as an altar for human sacrifice. It is not a Procrustes's bed, to which men and women shall be fitted, though they be slain. Rather do we prefer the sweet and understanding humanism of Jesus who saw that institutions were made for man and not man for institutions. His famous word about the Sabbath applies equally well to marriage.

It is Mr. Chesterton and not the advocate of divorce, who is a victim of what he calls "superstition." He sees in the outward legal or ecclesiastical process of marriage a sacred thing, to be preserved at any cost of human suffering or abnegation. This is a superstition—that superstition of formalism which has befogged the mind and hardened the heart from the beginning of time. What Mr. Chesterton should have been the first to see, after writing his exceedingly effective chapter on "The Story of the Family," is that what is sacred in the marriage relation is not the outward form but the inward impulse which, beginning in sex passion and ending in spiritual love, brings men and women together in the most wonderful relation of life. It is this love which is the essence of marriage, and should be the test of marriage. If men and women were perfect, it would be infallible in its choices, and eternal in its endurance. But men and women are not perfect—therefore does love make mistakes, go astray, deceive itself. Whatever the cause, the original impulse of devotion fails; and when the failure is irrevocable, it must be recognized. Divorce, properly speaking, is only the formal burial which necessarily follows upon the death of love. This burial is dictated by laws of moral sanitation. As Herbert Spencer has said, "The legal bond is improper if the natural bond ceases." The real tragedy in the whole case is the broken marriage, the death of love; and this tragedy exists in spite of us, whether the legal procedure of divorce is actually gone through with or not.

As a protest against much that is evil in the marriage state today, Mr. Chesterton's book is wholesome. But in diagnosis and cure, both, he begins at the wrong end. His supreme worry seems to be that "the effect of frivolous divorces will be frivolous marriage." We would turn this right around, and say *the effect of frivolous marriage is frivolous divorce.* Our task here is not to deny the remedy after the mistake is made, but to see to it that the mistake is not made. Marriage, in other words, must be freed from all material and worldly considerations, protected and guaranteed by rigorous conditions of initiation, ennobled by august recognitions. Marriage is our problem—its purification, redemption, emancipation. This solved, divorce will solve itself. "The superstition of divorce" is after all the idea that it *is* a superstition!

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

HELP FOR COURTS OF HERESY.

A little child shall lead them.—BIBLE.

Come, leave your candle, book and bell:
Is the man curst? His face will tell.
All records since the world began
Are written on the face of man.
His lack of love, his lack of awe,
Speak his defiance of the Law.
These Heresies are all there are
In any heaven, in any star.

O, Judges, when the doubts begin—
"Should he be out? Should he be in?"
Call on some little child to pick
With hasty glance the heretic.
For all that have the gift of grace
Will have it printed on the face.
Only dark thoughts that darken fate
Have power to excommunicate.

Yet there is danger in my plan
Of finding who is under ban.
For what if—looking round about—
The child should pick the judges out!

—*Edwin Markham.*

TO MY FRIEND.

William E. Williams.

Up from the yellow, sluggish mud of Creation's nether bed,
Striving onward from node to node, from dawn to surging dawn,
Rising above the thrall of flesh, brave where the spirit led,
He marched in a lonely pathway, ever and ever on.

Deep in earth's primal bosom the spark of his mind glowed bright,
Cast off the clutching circumstance, visioned the greater goal,
Rose to the ancient bitter task, struggled from height to height,
Onward and ever onward, a man in quest of a soul.

And at the last, when dark defeat swept over him in pain,
His eyes still sought the vision, still gleaming, still afar;
His spirit sprang from its prison, burst the encircling chain,
Leapt from the grave, forever free, and grasped a flaming star!

October 17, 1920. JAMES WALDO FAWCETT.

CONTRIBUTED

The Era of the Protestant Reformation in England and New England

An Historical Anthology Compiled by Charles William Wendte, D.D.

In Commemoration of the Three Hundredth Anniversary of the Landing of the Pilgrim Fathers of New England at Plymouth, Mass., in 1620

PART II.

VI. THE PILGRIM EXODUS.

1. PASTOR JOHN ROBINSON *and the sojourn in Holland* (1608-1620).

"The poor persecuted flock of Christ," despairing of rest in England, resolved to go to Holland, "where they heard was freedom of religion."

Historical Note.—In the early days of the Protestant Reform, there were European countries in which religious toleration had advanced practically much further than in England. The England of Henry the Eighth and Elizabeth as compared with the Netherlands was in a crude and backward condition.

In the commercial towns of the Netherlands, the free cities of Northern Italy and Southern Germany, and in the towns of the North Sea and the Baltic, priestcraft had less sway than elsewhere and the spirit was more modern.

The commercial, political and social relations between England and the Netherlands in the 16th century exerted a potent liberalizing influence upon all English society and religion. The Netherlands became the refuge and harbor of all heresies, and here the exiled Pilgrim Fathers, founders of New England, gained a largeness and breadth of view, as well as freedom of action, denied them in their own country. Many of the leading ideas and institutions, political, social and educational, which later were embodied in the civil polity of the Pilgrim colonists of New England, were derived or adapted from those they imbibed or encountered in Holland.

Among all the personages associated with the Pilgrim story none shines to-day with a brighter luster, none was so influential in deciding the course and shaping the religious and social destiny of the Pilgrim colonists, as their pastor, John Robinson, and this despite the fact that, like Moses of old, he was not permitted to cross the ocean with them and possess the promised land. In a farewell discourse to the departing members of his flock, on the eve of their pilgrimage to the New World, he warned them:

"I charge you before God and his blessed angels, that you follow me no further than you have seen me follow the Lord Jesus Christ. The Lord hath more truth yet to break forth out of his holy word. I cannot sufficiently bewail the condition of the reformed churches, who are come to a period in religion and will go no farther than the instruments of their Reformation. Luther and Calvin were great and shining lights in their times, yet they penetrated not into the whole council of God. I beseech you remember it—'tis an article of your church covenant—that you be ready to receive whatever truth shall be made known to you from the written word of God."

Entreating them to be Christian Progressives he reminded them of the fate of old Eli, of whom we read in the Book of Samuel, "that he fell backwards, and his neck brake, and he died."

In the Social Compact, or political constitution, of the Pilgrims, drawn up in the harbor of Provincetown, as well as in the Church covenant adopted in Plymouth, we recognize the spirit and teachings of John Robinson.

"We, the Lord's free people, join ourselves by a covenant of the Lord, into a church estate in the fellowship of the Gospel, to walk in all his ways made known, or to be made known to us, according to our best endeavors."

This first Pilgrim Church at Plymouth, in the evolution of truth, has become Unitarian in faith and connection. But it still consistently retains the Pilgrim covenant as its bond of church membership.

2. ELDER WILLIAM BREWSTER (1560-1644) *and the Voyage of the Mayflower,* 1620.

"They knew that they were pilgrims, and looked not much on those things, but lifted up their eyes to Heaven, their dearest country, and quieted their spirits."—*William Bradford's Narrative.*

"God sifted a whole nation that he might send choice grain into the Wilderness."—*Wm. Stoughton.* 1688.

"Our Pilgrim Fathers, landing from a little barque that had borne them away from the culture and civilization of Europe and the past, stepped upon an ice-ribbed and desolate shore, and there pitched their tent and raised their log-huts and sent their hymns and prayers up from reverent hearts, so that

> The stars heard and the sea!
> And the sounding aisles of the dim woods rang
> To the anthem of the free.

They subdued nature. The comforts of their former estate, the shelter of laws, the fellowship of men, could not make them forget that truth and the sense of God's approval and the achievements of the spiritual ends of life are the everlasting tasks of all true souls. When they found that all which civilization had done in the old world did not offer to nourish but threatened to crush their manliness, they came to the wilderness, to show on a background of ice, granite and famine that humble devotion to duty, reverence for the right and the vigorous will make men masters of the world, and compel the storm winds, the bleak shore and the unstained forests to welcome and cherish their spirits and ideas."—*Thomas Starr King.*

3. GOV. WILLIAM BRADFORD, 1588-1657.

William Bradford's History of Plymouth Plantation, when put together with Winthrop's History, is the Old Testament of New England. It is the Genesis, Exodus, Joshua and Judges of the Plymouth settlement. . . . In not a few passages his narrative rises to the dignity and pathos of the Bible.

As one small candle may light a thousand, so the light kindled here may in some sort shine even to the whole nation. —*William Bradford.*

A great hope they had of laying some good foundations, yea, though they should be but as stepping stones to others. —*William Bradford.*

4. JOHN WINTHROP (1588-1649) *and the Puritan Settlement of New England.* (Salem 1628, Boston 1630, Hartford 1639.)

John Winthrop, one of the noblest figures in American history.—*John Fiske.*

I shall call that my country where I may most glorify God and enjoy the presence of my dearest friends.—*John Winthrop.*

Farewell, dear England! Our hearts shall be fountains of tears for your everlasting welfare when we shall be in our poor cottages in the wilderness.—*John Winthrop.*

Historical Note.—The Puritans of New England were the

ancestors of one-third of the whole white population of the United States, as it was in 1834. Within the first fifteen years 21,200 persons (4,000 families) came over from England. Until 1800 the population of the United States was homogeneous, ninety-eight in a hundred being of English descent, largely sprung from country squires and yeomen, thrifty, industrious, docorous, liberty loving and religious. The 20,000 or more of Pilgrim antecedents in 1635 have increased to something like twenty millions today, whose influence and institutions predominate in the civic, educational and religious life of the American community. Truly, the promise to the Fathers has been fulfilled in a way exceeding all their hope and prayer. "Get thee out of thy country and from thy kindred and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee, and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great, and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."

5. Roger Williams (1599-1683) *and the Providence Plantations.*

It was to Roger Williams that our American System of a free church in a free state was largely due. To cite his own word, "The Civil Republic and the Religious Republic (i. e., the Church) are not opposed but independent of each other."

Again he declared (1644): "It is the will and command of God, that the most paganish, Jewish, Turkish or anti-Christian conscience be granted to all men in all nations and countries, and that they are only to be fought against with the sword, which is only able to conquer, to wit, the sword of God's spirit, the Word of God." This principle was incorporated into the Constitution of his settlement of Rhode Island, the first commonwealth on this continent to affirm the separation of church and state.

6. William Penn (1644-1718). *Founder of Pennsylvania.*

"O that all Christendom had lived in peace and unity that they might by their moderation have judged both Turk and Jew, and let all have their liberty that own God and Jesus Christ."—*George Fox.*

"No man nor number of men upon earth hath power or authority to rule over men's consciences in religious matters."—*William Penn.*

In closing these testimonies to the increasing liberalism of the Pilgrim founders of New England, we may cite Rev. Cotton Mather of Boston, who in a letter to his son, Rev. Samuel Mather, 1663-1728, wrote: "Piety will anon be the only basis of [church] Union, and pious men in several forms will come to love and live as brethren."

THE CHURCH UNIVERSAL.

"I belong to the Universal Church: nothing shall separate me from it. In saying this, however, I am no enemy to particular churches. In the present age of the world it is perhaps best that those who agree in theological opinions should worship together. I look on the various churches of Christendom with no feeling of enmity. The Romish Church is illustrated by great names. Her gloomy convents have often been brightened by fervent love to God and man. Her St. Louis, and Fénelon, and Massillon, and Cheverus; her missionaries who have carried Christianity to the ends of the earth; her sisters of charity who have carried relief and solace to the most hopeless want and pain; do not these teach us that in the Romish Church the Spirit of God has found a home? In the English Church we meet the names of Latimer, Hooker, Barrow, Leighton, Berkeley, and Heber; in the Dissenting Calvinistic Church, Baxter, Howe, Watts, Doddridge, and Robert Hall; among the Quakers, George Fox, William Penn, Robert Barclay, and our own Anthony Benezet and John Woolman; in the Anti-Trinitarian Church, John Milton, John Locke, Samuel Clarke, Price, and Priestley. To repeat these names does the heart good. They breathe a fragrance through the common air. They lift up the whole race to which they belonged. With the churches of which they were pillars or chief ornaments I have many sympathies; nor do I condemn the union of ourselves to these or any other churches whose doctrines we approve, provided that we do it without severing ourselves in the least from the Universal Church. On this point we cannot be too earnest. We must shun the spirit of sectarianism as from hell. We must shudder at the thought of shutting up God in any denomination. We must think no man the better for belonging to our communion; no man the worse for belonging to another. We must look with undiminished joy on goodness, though it shine forth from the most adverse sect. Christ's spirit must be equally dear and honored, no matter where manifested. To confine God's love or his good spirit to any party, sect, or name is to sin against the fundamental law of the kingdom of God, to break that living bond with Christ's Universal Church which is one of our chief helps to perfection."—*Dr. William Ellery Channing.*

VII. The Pilgrim's Religion.

"Calvin lifted the individual above pope and prelate, above priest and presbyter, above Catholic Church, National Church, and general synod—above indulgences, remissions and absolutions from fellow-mortals, into the immediate presence of God, whose eternal, irreversible decree is made by himself alone. Calvin reformed doctrine, ritual and preaching, and by establishing ruling elders in each church, and an elective synod, he secured to his polity a representative character which combined authority with popular rights.

"If from the outside peculiarities we look to the genius of the sect itself Puritanism had two cardinal principles: Faith in the absolute sovereignty of God, whose will is perfect right; and the equality of all who believe that his will is to be done. It was religion struggling in, with, and for the people; a war against tyranny and superstition. 'Its absurdities,' says one of its scoffers, 'were the shelter for the noble principles of liberty. It was its office to engraft the new institutions of popular energy upon the old European system of a feudal aristocracy and popular servitude; the good was permanent; the outward influences which were the signs of the party, were of transient duration, like the clay and ligaments which hold the graft in its place, and are brushed away as soon as the scion is firmly united.' "—*George Bancroft.*

VIII. The Church Polity of the Pilgrims.

In the New Testament narrative of the Founding of the Church of Christ, and the pure congregationalism of the Jewish synagogue, we may find the main sources of the church polity of the Pilgrim Fathers.

"By the ordinance of Christ Priests and Bishops were all one. I boldly assert one thing, namely, that in the primitive Church, or in the time of Paul, two orders of the clergy were sufficient; that is, a priest (Presbyter) and a deacon. In like manner I maintain that in the time of Paul, Presbyter and Bishop

were names of the same office. All other degrees and orders have their origin in the pride of Caesar. If, indeed, they were necessary to the Church, Christ would not have been silent respecting them."—*John Wyclif,* 1324-1384.

"Ordination we account nothing else but the solemn putting of a man into his place and office in the church, whereunto he had right before, by election; being like the installing of a magistrate in the commonwealth."—*Cambridge Platform,* 1651.

"The Pilgrims brought with them to the New World a form of Christianity which I cannot better describe than by styling it a democratic and republican religion. This contributed powerfully to the establishment of a republic and a democracy in public affairs." —*De Tocqueville.*

IX. THE CIVIL POLITY OF THE PILGRIMS.

Historical Note.—On Saturday, the 21st of November, 1620 (the 11th according to the old style of computing time), the Pilgrim Fathers arrived at Cape Cod, in the Mayflower, and anchored in Provincetown Harbor. Before making the usual arrangements for landing, they entered into a combination which served as the foundation of their government in their new home. The agreement was drawn up and signed in the cabin of the Mayflower by the heads of families and such others as were considered of proper age, the act being held in their opinion as firm as any royal patent, and in some respects more so. The form of instrument, generally known in history as the SOCIAL COMPACT of the FOREFATHERS, is preserved in Bradford's "History of Plymouth Plantation," in the following words:

IN YE NAME OF GOD, AMEN. We whose names are underwritten . . . haveing under-taken for ye glorie of God, and advancement of ye Christain faith, and honour of our King & Countrie, a voyage to plant ye first colonie in ye northerne parts of Virginia, doe by these presents solemnly & mutualy, in ye presence of God and one of another, covenant, & combine our selves together into a civill body politick for our better ordering & preservation, & furtherance of ye ends aforesaid; and by virtue hearof to enacte, constitute and frame such just & equall lawes, ordinances, acts, constitutions, & offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meete & convenient for ye generall good of ye Colonie; unto which we promise all due submission and obedience.

"This," says the historian George Bancroft, "was the birth of popular constitutional liberty."

I do solemnly bind myself that I will caste my vote as I shall judge in mine own conscience may best conduce to the public weal, so help me God!—*Freeman's Oath,* 1634.

"Congregationalism was historically the mother of our civil liberties. It was so first at Plymouth and in the Massachusetts colonies. It was so later in the days of the Revolution. . . . Itself a democracy, training all its members to individual responsibility and labor—under the highest and purest pressure of motive—its natural tendencies will be best for a Republic."—*H. M. Dexter.*

"The first human subject and original of civil power is the people . . . the formal reason of government is the will of the community. A democracy is a very honorable and regular government according to the dictates of right reason . . ., most agreeable to the just and natural prerogative of human beings."—*Rev. John Wise, of Ipswich, Mass.,* 1652-1725.

"The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us; that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to the cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."—*Abraham Lincoln.*

"Let us keep the path for the democracy of toil and struggle open to the last material reward to which it is entitled. Let us keep the path of the democracy of the mind open through every grade of education. Let us keep the path for the democracy of the soul open for every spiritual privilege, even if in so doing we must reconstruct our churches."

—*Pres. Wm. J. Tucker.*

America, imposing is your errand and sublime.
The splendor of the sea is in your name, the splendors and terrors in your heart.
'Tis yours to build the world-state in your dream;
To strike down Mammon and his brazen breed,
Yours to shape the mighty deed,
To build the brother-future,
America, rise to your high-born part!
Over all lands a winged hope is flying.

—*Edwin Markham.*

"Mankind is looking now for freedom of life. Henceforth inviolable security of life, of worship and of industrial and social development, should be guaranteed to all peoples.

"We are but one of the champions for the rights of mankind. Our object is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world, as against selfish and autocratic power—to make the world safe for democracy.

"On the righteous passion for justice, all law, all structures alike of family, of state, and of mankind, must rest."—*President Woodrow Wilson.*

Not failure, but low aim is crime.—*James Russell Lowell.*

X. THE PILGRIM LEGACY.

Worshippers of light ancestral make the present light a crime,
Was the Mayflower launched by cowards, steered by men behind their time?
Turn those tracks toward past or future that make Plymouth Rock sublime?

. . . . . .

They were men of present valor, stalwart, old iconoclasts,
Unconvinced by axe or gibbet that all virtue was the past's;
But we make their truth our falsehood, thinking that hath made us free,
Hoarding it in mouldy parchments, while our tender spirits flee
The rude grasp of that great Impulse which drove them across the sea.

. . . . . .

Shall we make their creed our jailor? Shall we in our haste to slay,
From the tombs of the old prophets steal the funeral lamps away
To light up the martyr-faggots round the prophets of today?

Now occasions teach new duties; time makes ancient good uncouth;
They must upward still and onward, who would keep abreast of truth;
Lo, before us gleam her campfires! We ourselves must Pilgrims be,
Launch our Mayflower, and steer boldy through the desperate Winter sea,
Nor attempt the Future's portal with the Past's blood-rusted key.

—*James Russell Lowell. From "The Crisis."*

"O Beautiful, my country!"
Be thine a nobler care
Than all thy wealth of commerce,
Thy harvests waving fair;
Be it thy pride to lift up
The manhood of the poor;
Be thou to the oppressed
Fair freedom's open door!

For thee our fathers suffered,
For thee they toiled and prayed;

Upon thy holy altar
  Their willing lives they laid.
Thou hast no common birthright,
  Grand memories on thee shine;
The blood of pilgrim nations
  Commingled flows in thine!

"O beautiful, our country!"
  Round thee in love we draw;
Thine is the grace of freedom,
  The majesty of law;
Be righteousness thy sceptre,
  Justice thy diadem,
And on thy shining forehead
  Be peace the crowning gem!

—*Frederick L. Hosmer.*

THE END

SELECTED

The Kansas Court of Industrial Justice

[The problem of strikes is one of the most serious problems of the day. Governor Henry J. Allen of Kansas thinks he has solved the problem. Whether we agree with his method or not, we must agree that it is an important experiment, and should desire information as to its working. Here is Governor Allen's own story, as stated in a speech before the Convention of the American Electric Railway Association, at Atlantic City, October 13, 1920. This abstract is taken from the November issue of *Aera*.—THE EDITORS.]

You all remember when the coal strike came on last winter. A most monstrous attack was made on the public, in the interest of that very polite phrase called "economic pressure." The mining of coal ceased. In our state everybody was out of coal except a few of the forehanded who bought coal in the summertime, and in two weeks we closed all the schoolhouses, the business houses closed, and there was suffering in the homes and suffering in the hospitals.

I went to the Supreme Court and asked if they would not turn over to the State the custody of some 300 or 400 coal mines, in order that we might produce coal for the people who would suffer otherwise. I will never forget the look of surprise that came over the face of Chief Justice Johnson, who had been at the head of our Supreme Court for forty years. He asked: "What allegation will you make on which to take these mines over?" I replied, "Judge, any allegation you think will work."

After we took over the mines I went around for a week pleading with the miners to go to work for the state, realizing they would not go to work for the operators. I offered them an increase in wages, and guaranteed that whatever benefits came to them out of the controversy would be retroactive, and in justice to the miners I think that a great many of them would have been glad to go back to work when I placed before them the picture of suffering that would ensue. Hundreds came and said, "We want to go back to work, but there is just one man who controls the situation, and unless you can get the president of this district to order us back to work, we cannot go back."

One man, an American born miner, said, "I will stay at work," and he remained for some time. Several weeks later, when we had broken the strike and the mines had gone back to the owners and operators, and the men had gone back to work, this man, Guffy, had a meeting with his union and the union suspended him for ninety-nine years. They then went to Guffy's landlord and said, "We have blacklisted Guffy, and we do not want you to keep him here," and they went to his groceryman and told him not to sell Guffy any provisions, and similarly with the other trades people in the place. They drove him out of the district. That was the genial spirit of brotherhood that existed in that district.

When we took over the operation of the mines I called for volunteers who would go and dig coal and relieve the people of their sufferings. I was not concerned at that moment in the justice of the fight between the operators and the miners. In my opinion they were both playing the game of human greed. I was concerned only for the relief of the public, and in twenty-four hours more than 11,000 people in Kansas sent me word saying, "We'll come and dig coal."

I took from among those who made this offer several hundred young men to man the strip mines of the State and in selecting them I selected chaps who had been in service overseas. I had seen them over there overcoming obstacles of such great nature that when I heard the district president of the miners' union say that not a pound of coal would be produced in that district except by union men, and knowing what these lads could do, I knew the district was in for a surprise.

The morning when the first trainload of volunteers arrived in Pittsburg all the miners were assembled at the station to give this train a proper welcome. Then these chaps began to get off the cars. They were a lot of stalwart, keen-eyed, kindly-faced young chaps, dressed in the service uniform of their country, and they showed obviously what they were—a lot of good-natured young Kansans, who had come there, not to take part in a labor war, but to relieve the emergency of the public, and the miners themselves realized how incongruous it would be to call them the things they had come to call them. They received them in silence and these chaps started up the street in Pittsburg on the way to the mine. A striker said to one of the boys:

"Bud, you ain't going to the mines tonight? You can't dig any coal, the pits are full of water, the weather is below zero, and we could not mine any coal if we wanted to." The young chap trudged along and answered him, out of the corner of his mouth:

"Say, did you ever see any trenches in France?"

Well, these Americans went out, and that night, while they were throwing out the guard line they began to pump the water from the pits and the next day, against obstacles which seemed to be insuperable at one of the mines, they had produced a carload of coal. I have never heard so much cackling over one egg in my life. The next day they mined ten carloads of coal. The next day thirty, and in ten days these young chaps, who had never seen a coal mine, but who were trained in all the fundamentals of American belief in American justice, had produced enough coal to relieve the emergency in more than 200 Kansas communities that were suffering from lack of coal.

But, as these boys did this great task, they did another thing, fundamentally of greater value even than that of mining the coal we needed. They arrived at the conclusion for themselves and for all of us that the State has the right to protect the public against anybody's strike in an essential industry.

And then a special session of the legislature was called to deal with the situation and to write into the statute book that the paramount right is the right of the public. As soon as the legislature was convened, and I announced the sort of law we intended to pass,

everybody who belonged to anything got in touch with the legislature. Two great groups came, and the leadership of organized labor was divided into two classes, the radicals and the conservatives. The radicals wanted to bring to the capitol 50,000 union labor men and have them march seven times around the capitol building, but the conservatives prevailed, so they came with their lobbies, and employing capital with its lobby, but organized capital was more cunning than organized labor. Organized labor said, "We will not have this law, it means voluntary servitude." Capital was more politic. It said, "This is a great law, this is the finest movement forward since the days of Adam, but the law should be changed a little in this respect, and in that respect, and in the other respect." When we finally added together all the suggestions that employing capital had submitted to us, we found that they would have the effect of removing all the teeth from the upper jaw of the law.

I am glad to say that when the law was passed it was passed essentially as originally prepared, with a full set of teeth in the upper and lower jaws. It has been held constitutional by the Supreme Court of the State; it is the law of the State, and everybody expects that it is to be enforced just as every other law in that State is enforced.

You may say that you have taken from labor the only weapon it had, in its right to strike. My friends, if we had taken away from labor that weapon and had given it nothing else, then it would have been a very unjust law. Everyone of us here must realize that the history of progress in the civilization of our day is the history of the better condition of the workingman. It is true we have taken from him in Kansas the weapon of the strike, but we have given him in every honorable controversy a more dependable and usable weapon. We have given him the backing of the government, and it is the first time he has ever had a weapon that will do business. Down in the Pittsburg district, where the need for this legislation first occurred, there had been during the forty-five months that preceded the writing of the Kansas Industrial Court bill 705 strikes at various mines, fifteen strikes a month, and these fifteen strikes had produced in the victories for the poor miner altogether a total sum of $784.93, and they had cost him in loss of wages $3,866,000, and last year these poor chaps paid out of their slender purses for the maintenance of their organization and strike benefits $157,000.

Ah, surely, a strike, the weapon that cost them so much and can do so little, is not so effective a weapon as the weight of justice guaranteed by an impartial and righteous government.

Out there the most frequently uttered misrepresentation of the law is that it takes away from a man his God-given right to quit work. I would not favor a law of that kind. What the law really says is this: It says to this man or to this group of men, "You may quit work whenever you wish, but you cannot come here tomorrow with your pockets full of dynamite, to keep this group of men who wish to continue on the job from working." The right to work is just as sacred as the right to loaf. It is the duty of governments to protect both men in their natural inclinations.

The court holds that the basis of industrial business is founded upon collective bargaining, and when there is any effort to get together through conciliation and arbitration, the court encourages it, but when they fail to reach a conclusion and a strike threatens the public, the court steps in with its substitute for the strike, and for the protection of the public it says that these industries shall keep functioning and in the meantime we will decide on the justice of your cause. That is all there is to it.

A man representing labor asked me the other day: "Why don't you put on the court a representative of organized labor?" I answered: "For the same reason we did not put on the court a representative of employing capital." If a representative of organized labor and a representative of employing capital and a so-called representative of the public had been put upon the court, would we have had a court of justice? No, we would have had a board of arbitration.

We have discovered in the last sixty years of trial that arbitration does not work. If it does work, it does not do any good. When you select a man representing the side of employing capital, and I select a man representing the side of organized labor, and these two agree upon a third, who is the umpire, it may do one of three things. A board of arbitration may sit and give a decision in favor of the street car industry, or it may give a decision in favor of labor, or it may bicker back and forth and produce dog fall, but into the considerations of that board of arbitration there never comes any concern for the rights of the public, which in all essential industries is justly concerned in a quarrel, in the bringing on of which it had no responsibility.

So we have discarded arbitration, because it is worthless, and we have established a court of adjudication, and they are men appointed by the executive because of their impartiality, because of the justice of them, because of the honesty of them, because of the integrity of them, and their impartiality, justice, honesty and integrity are guaranteed by a responsible government. We have appointed them upon the broad principle that the public is entitled to this protection; that labor is entitled to protection and that capital is entitled to protection. Their appoinment is based on the oldest principle in human government, a principle which constituted one of the twelve laws inscribed on the Roman tablet—"Let the safety of the public be the supreme law," and you may write about all the sermons you wish upon the rights of labor, but whenever society is menaced it will come back to that broad declaration of the power of government.

As I see it, we have placed the law upon the oldest principle of state government, and there never was any question as to whether we could do this. There is no difference in the class of quarrels, there is merely a difference in the name of them, and there has never been any reason why government should not apply justice for the laboring man and for the employes in that quarrel, but the reason why that action has never been taken has been that statesmanship has not dared to brave the wrath of the classes on either side. The fundamental principle has been there since there has been an organized society.

It was Edmund Burke, the great Englishman, who said that all the government of England, that all its armies, that all its policemen, existed for the mere purpose of getting twelve honest men in a jury box. That is all there is to it—that is the police power of

government, the broadest, the one illimitable power that society imposes upon itself, the fundamental need of protection.

Now, if we are going to have protection, then there must be a guarantee, of course, that justice shall go with that protection. And so, in Kansas, where we have substituted impartial adjudication for the strike, or arbitration that precedes the strike, we are getting good results. The court has been in operation four months and a half. We have decided something over a dozen cases brought by heads of organized labor. We have decided some cases brought by capital, but organized labor has made more use of the court than capital has. Our first case was a street car case. The interurban system known as the Joplin, Pittsburg & Galena Railway Company in the last three years had two strikes, a strike in 1918 that lasted ninety days and cost the laboring men thousands upon thousands of dollars in loss of wages, cost the company sufficient to bring it to the verge of a receivership, and cost the public untold millions. And then at the end of ninety days the strikers came back and solicited from the employers the privilege of going back to work under the old wages and under the old conditions. And all that occurred because of a strike; all the loss that was involved was pure waste.

When the court had been established, there came Freeman, the president of the Kansas Federation of Labor, a great man in his field, who asked for a living wage for the men, and then the presiding officer of our court called his attention to the fact that that is language which we do not use in the Kansas Court of Industrial Relations. The law says that every such man is entitled to a fair and just wage and a wholesome place in which to work. What is a living wage? It is a wage sufficient to meet the costs of subsistence. What is a fair and just wage? It is a wage sufficient to meet the cost of subsistence, plus sufficient to give the laboring man an opportunity to enjoy for himself and his family some of the various forms of modern civilization, plus sufficient to enable him by reasonable frugality to build up a safeguard against sickness and old age. And so they gave him a fair and just wage.

Then the railway company said: "Well, we will have to grant this wage, but if we do, we will not have enough money to pay it." They came into court and the court, using exactly the same pendulum it had used for labor, investigated the cost of material, the cost of operation, and the condition of the district, and gave the railway company a sufficient increase in freight and passenger rates to enable it to meet the obligation of the new order. And the public, which would not have been satisfied with the results of a strike, whose attitude probably kept the railway company from raising rates, that very same public said: "That is a just order," and the public accepted the order with satisfaction. The carmen who brought the cause accepted the order, and then they took the order, and in a committee representing the employers and employes, they fitted it into all the grooves of that railway system, and now they have peace and prosperity and the public is satisfied. Why? Because the order came out of a court of justice, and all sides were taken into consideration.

In the case of the Topeka Street Railway Company they had strikes without effect, and then when the Kansas Court of Industrial Relations was created, the motormen came with a petition asking for an increase of wages. The increase was given them and they were satisfied. The street car company officials said that they would try it for three months. They thought it would "bust" them. They tried it and came back in a little while and said: "It will 'bust' us," and so the court, taking into consideration their condition, increased passenger fares and now nobody is opposed to the arrangement, and the organization is functioning and the public is satisfied.

A short time ago I spoke in Denver before the Colorado Bar Association, and at that time Senator Thomas, one of the great Americans—I am mighty sorry he is leaving the United States Senate—asked this question: "If we had a court like the Kansas Court of Industrial Relations in Colorado, what would have happened when the strike last spring began?" I said: "Senator, the strike would not have happened." "Why?" he asked. I replied: "Because any strike that happens in Kansas these days is a strike against government, and I will not debate with any man what is going to happen to him if he strikes against the government."

The particular thing I want to call your attention to is the absolutely equal balance of this law. It says to employers: You shall not close down your packing houses or flour mills or street railways, because of a conflict, involving a wage controversy, and you shall not use this conflict as a means of affecting the cost of your commodity—you shall not conspire against the public. And it says to labor: You shall not conspire to close down any of these essential institutions upon the product of which the public depends for its welfare; you shall not conspire to bring to bear upon the public that murderous thing we call "economic pressure."

It is a fine law, and has brought capital and labor in, and we are all general public now under the control of government. My friends, if moral principles do not exist in American institutions for the extension of their protective power to you and me, or to labor and capital, then government is a failure, for the challenge here is the challenge of those who, in the interest of a class, would build inside the shell of the political construction of America an economic government controlled by unionism.

THE FIRE-FLY.

Fire-fly, Fire-fly,
Let me see your lantern.
Will your light go out in rain?
I will let you go again;
I won't cause you any pain.
Fire-fly, let me see your lantern.

Do you carry gas or oil?
Have you battery—lightning coil?
Is it wood or coal you burn?
Did it take you long to learn?
Tell me where you keep your matches.

Are you made of bits of moon?
Is your lantern on your shoon?
Won't you come again till June?
Please to let me see your lantern.

—*Agnes Ryan.*

"A Whisper of Fire," The Four Seas Company.

THE STUDY TABLE

SONNETS FROM MARCUS AURELIUS, by James Vila Blake. Thomas P. Halpin Co., Chicago. 70 pages. Paper.

An unique and attractive volume has just come from the press at a most timely moment for it will answer at once the question of what gift to make to one's intellectual friends, one's poetry loving friends, one's classical friends, and these are perhaps the friends for whom it is usually most difficult to find just the right gift.

James Vila Blake, whose name the old time readers of UNITY know well, has found in Marcus Aurelius material for poetic uses and has written thirty-one sonnets based on striking and familiar passages from the great Stoic. The arrangement of the volume is well conceived. Each sonnet occupies a page facing which appears the original Greek text and a prose translation of the passage on which it is based. The sonnets are preceded by a Proem and followed by an Epode, also in sonnet form, and a brief Preface tells how, on re-reading Marcus Aurelius aloud to a group of friends one evening, the author was struck by the possibilities for poetical expression therein contained. Many years later he returned to the idea, and the present delightful volume is the result. One regrets only the perishability of the otherwise attractive and artistic paper binding, for the book surely is of those which one wants permanently in one's library. Perhaps in a second edition, the publisher will remedy this defect.

Mr. Blake has selected for his purpose many of the homely, simple passages from Aurelius, those dealing with the trials and problems of daily life, of association with other people, of conduct under difficult and trying conditions, as well as some of his more profoundly philosophical teachings. Of the former type, we quote one of the most successful:

Halt! To the right about! Away with you, enemies!
  Nay, rather,—second thoughts are best—here stay!
Come on and do your worst, and cry what shame it is
  Fellows like me cumber the earth a day!
Take counsel now, be warlike as you will,
  Brush up your pandoors' whiskers, your hussars
Clap on their helmets, spit your leaden pill,
  Bare your sabres and hack your sanguine scars,
Your venoms ply, your wily slanders wake,
  Your stabbing points of lies polish the more!
Ye can not get you where I live, nor make
  My ruling faculty worse than before.
Forsooth ye make a very pretty foe,
That can not hurt me and soon prove it so.

Perhaps for sheer beauty of diction and form, the poetic counterpart of the familiar homily upon Change is most noteworthy and pleasing:

Consider the delicious fluency
  Of your warm marble pool. The seed, the sprout,
The bud and flower, the foliage, the fuel tree,
  These change to bear the soft lavation out.
First leaf and blossom wane to form the wood,
  Which then must burn to heat the temperate bath—
Fellows in timbered aisles that stalwart stood,
  But bent in lumberman's victorious path.
Who feareth changes, feareth what befall
  With sweet necessitous kind service still;
And the Lord Life in the kingdom of the All
  Questions not with you—change you shall and will.
But each one's haps a fervent good may do,
As the tree burneth prosperously for you.

The passages dealing with Life and Death are likewise well chosen and adequately elaborated in the verse form. This meditation upon the possible sudden arrival of the transition we call Death is particularly forceful:

Conceive a whisper certified thine ear,
  Some deity above thy shoulder bending,
That thou must leave thine earthly summit here,
  And all thy many matters put to ending;
And say to-morrow 'twere, or the next morrow,
  Appointed for thine expedition brave,
Thou begging the later day with cries and sorrow;
  Wert not thou then indeed a sorry knave?
Then reason: For beauty's sake be 't not my song
  To traverse years, but this day to live stoutly;
For beauty hangeth not upon how long
  I look, but in what way and how devoutly.
Grandeur's not bulk, naught long that ends at all;
That now I live, this sole doth me appall.

Mr. Blake is to be congratulated upon having done and done well an unusual and valuable piece of artistic work, and lovers of Aurelius are fortunate in having their favorite so fittingly re-apparelled. The book belongs, also, in the life-helping group, because of its deep philosophical truths and its encouraging heartening attitude of calm endurance of the ills and trials of daily living. The harshness which one perhaps unconsciously associates with the Stoic philosophy has been much softened by Mr. Blake's poetic interpretation.

I BELIEVE IN GOD THE FATHER. John Faville, D. D., Ph.D. The Stratford Company, Boston, Mass. 122 pages.

Readers of UNITY have long been familiar with the name of John Faville, for many years pastor of the First Congregational Church at Appleton, Wisconsin, and long time friend of UNITY's late editor. They will welcome his recent volume of sermons, "I Believe in God the Father," which from the standpoint of a liberal Christian seeks to supplant the older ideas of God as Creator, as Sovereign, as Master and Judge, with the idea which Jesus taught of God as the Father of all mankind.

In doing away with the sense of fear and distance and superstition with which in greater or less degree the orthodox world has contemplated the being it called God, Dr. Faville has rendered great service and done much to liberate the thinking of those who have not yet become acquainted in any real and vital sense with the fatherliness of God.

To those who have grown into the idea of God immanent in his universe, God evolving with his world, God everywhere present in the lives of humanity, the book perhaps presents no new or advanced conception, but it certainly is in almost every one of its positions a distinct advance on the current orthodox attitudes as represented in church and creeds, for it honestly attempts to "interpret God in the terms of his fatherhood instead of the metaphysics of a Trinity." Moreover on occasions the author comes very near the concept of a growing God, as for example when he says:

> Creation is not some exceptional action of God within a certain circle of the past. God's dealings with us are a continual creation. He did not make the world and then leave it. He is still in it, still making it.

Of sin and the theory of atonement, he says:

> Any doctrine of the atonement, any interpretation of the cross, must adjust itself to a doctrine of sin that does not make it first a defiance of a sovereign will, but the rejection of a paternal love.

Dr. Faville stresses the need in the individual life of a real sense of God:

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP AND GOOD WILL.

This World Friendship design has been prepared by the Commission on International Friendship and Good Will to supply a convenient means of passing along the word of friendliness in group relationships, especially between national or industrial groups. It is issued in colors—a silver star on a light blue ground, blue border, the quotation standing out in white letters and WORLD FRIENDSHIP in red. On correspondence paper, letter heads, invitations, receipts, menu cards, on programs, church bulletins or notices, it adds a decorative touch of color and spreads abroad the fundamental thought that leads to international peace. It may be obtained in small size, gummed, at fifty cents a hundred or five dollars a thousand from World Friendship Seal, Room 8098C, 19 S. La Salle St., Chicago, Ill. Organizations desiring to increase the circulation of this idea in their community and also add to their own funds for some international cause, will be furnished a supply on consignment, together with suggestions for increasing their international service fund.

WORLD PEACE ON EARTH GOODWILL AMONG MEN FRIENDSHIP

COPYRIGHT

TO THE CHURCHES AND THE CHRISTIAN PEOPLE OF AMERICA.

The Christian Churches of the United States are called to recognize and accept their responsibility to assist the distressed peoples of Europe, who are suffering, to the full, the grievous consequences of a war from which we as a nation have emerged relatively unscathed.

The signers of this appeal have recently visited Europe, some under the special commission of their respective ecclesiastical bodies and nearly all under the commission of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, which designated them as "Friendly Visitors" to the churches of Europe from the Christian people of America. Delegations have personally investigated the conditions in Europe, especially in most of the needy countries, including Hungary, Austria, Poland, Germany, Czecho-Slovakia, Roumania, Transylvania and Jugo-Slavia. They hereby testify, from thoughtful inquiry and intimate personal observation, that the descriptions of those pitiable conditions have not been exaggerated and are so extreme that they cannot be exaggerated. The need is urgent and desperate.

Great populations are hungry, almost naked, and are becoming the prey of epidemic diseases which, in their undernourished and impoverished condition, they are unable to resist. The recent death of one of our own "Friendly Visitors" from one of these causes is a striking testimony of this fact.

The situation bears with special heaviness upon the children, not only because of their helplessness, but because the elemental materials for their nourishment are the things most needed. Millions of little ones are actually starving and millions more are so retarded in their growth that there is imminent danger of a rising generation of anæmic and undeveloped men and women.

The needs of children in the form of food, clothing and medicines are immediately urgent and, although enormous, must be met and met at once by benevolent contributions which should be made entirely in the form of money. The appoaching winter will bring added horrors. We find that the policy governing the child-feeding is based on self-help and local resources, both in personal service and commodities, and that everything possible is being done to promote responsibility and avoid pauperizing.

The responsibility is so great and the task of its economic, efficient and prompt administration is so imperative that it must be met through some great common and highly responsible agency. The European Relief Council has therefore been formed under the chairmanship of Mr. Herbert Hoover, composed of representatives of the responsible agencies, including the Federal Council. This Relief Council has the best knowledge of conditions, the most efficient leadership and the best facilities for the wise administration of this task.

We earnestly commend the accompanying appeal from the Relief Council, in which we have the most absolute confidence, to the Christian people of America, with the hope that pastors will present it to their people with all its force for as long a time as may be needed and that, especially, they will respond to the request that it be presented with all its power on Sunday, December nineteenth. Collections and individual gifts should be sent to Mr. Franklin K. Lane, Treasurer of the European Relief Council, Guaranty Trust Co., 140 Broadway, New York City.

A pathetic illustration of the need for this call was afforded by an orphanage visited by one of our delegations. The children were quiet and well-behaved, with intelligent faces, winsome children, to whom one's heart instinctively went out. A young woman with one assistant was in charge. Because money is scarce and food dear, they cannot afford servants, so these educated and refined young women do all the work of the orphanage themselves—making the beds, cooking and serving the food, and caring for the children. As we looked into the spotlessly clean and well-kept rooms and saw on every side the evidence of thoughtful and loving care, we had a feeling that He who of old took little children in His arms must be very near to that place. As we went away we could not forbear asking the young lady in charge: "Can you manage to get enough for all these children to eat?" A wistfully tender look came into her face as she replied: "We give them all we have, but it is not enough. They cry for more. It is very hard. They are little children and they do not understand."

They do not understand. Do you?

"God has forgotten us," a hungry little girl wailed to her sister. The sister's lip trembled, but she bravely replied: "No, God has not forgotten us, He has told somebody to help us, and that somebody has forgotten us."

It was Jesus who said: "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

The United States is the strongest and

We talk of experiencing religion, but the Christian life means experiencing the Father. . . . I shall be more than satisfied if this book leads anyone to experience the Father.

In attempting to present some measure of this aspect of the relation of God to man, he says:

Gather all the best qualities of all the best parents you have ever known, add to that all that your own good father and father mean to you, and then all that your own best relations to your child include, and multiply all this by Jesus' words about Jesus' life with His Father, and we are on the way at least to understand that parenthood is the fundamental relation of Deity to humanity, of God to man.

And again with telling aptness:

Think of the contrast between the life of Jesus with his Father and that of Jonathan Edwards with his God and we begin to realize what it means to the person to experience the Father.

The implications of a real acceptance of this conception of God in its effect upon the attitude of men toward each other, in sweeping away all barriers of sex and race, in bringing men to a practical belief in the universal brotherhood of man are clearly stated and vigorously insisted upon, as well as the practical effect that such an experience will have upon war. The absence of this conception in the minds of men the author believes to be the reason why "the war record of the non-Christian Roman Empire is almost a skirmish as compared with the last war record of so-called Christian Europe."

Dr. Faville's discussion of the creeds and the church and of the reasons why they have failed to give to the world this conception of the parenthood of God is particularly forceful, and sees far into the causes that have dominated organized Christianity since the days of Jesus and blinded it to the real truths of his teachings. He also finds in this idea renewed foundation for a belief in human immortality.

The book should go far among both ministers and laymen of liberal Christian and orthodox churches and should do much to bring to them a broader and nobler conception of religious life and its practical working out among the problems of the world of today.

SUSAN QUACKENBUSH.

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

. . . . . "who would be abreast of thought"

SHOULD READ

The Christian Register

16 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

A Weekly Journal of Constructive and Progressive Religion

Subscription $3 Club Rates
SEND FOR FREE COPY

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028

Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

most resourceful nation in the world and "we that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak."

NEHEMIAH BOYNTON,
Chairman of the Commission.
ARTHUR J. BROWN,
Chairman of the Committee on Fraternal Relations.

Federal Council of Churches, Dec. 1.

AN APPEAL TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

Three and one-half million children in Eastern and Central Europe have no alternative to disaster between now and next harvest except American aid. For months, because the needy were so numerous and the available funds so limited, these most helpless sufferers in the track of war have been admitted to American feeding stations only if tragically under-nourished, and have received American medical aid only if desperately threatened by death from disease.

Winter is closing down. The money of many nations is valueless outside their own boundaries. Economic and crop conditions, aggravated over considerable areas by actual warfare last summer, make famine, with its terrible train of diseases, a certain visitor until next harvest. Inevitably the helpless children will suffer most. No child can grow to health and sanity on the pitiful makeshifts for food with which millions of European adults must content themselves this winter. It is obvious that the remedy can come only from outside.

America saved 6,000,000 European children winter before last. Normal recuperation cut the need nearly in half last year, but unusual conditions have resulted in scant shrinkage of child destitution during the twelvemonth just past. The response of America must now decide whether 3,500,000 of these charges, in acute distress, shall begin to be turned away in January from more than 17,000 asylums, hospitals, clinics and feeding stations dependent on American support. There would be no tragedy in history so sweeping or so destructive of those who can deserve no evil.

The undersigned organizations, working among every race and creed, many engaged also in other forms of relief, agree unanimously that the plight of these helpless children should have complete priority in overseas charity until the situation is met. This is an issue without politics and without religious lines. There can be no danger of pauperization, for the $23,000,000 for child food, and the $10,000,000 for medical service that we seek, will relieve only the critical cases. The medical supplies, of course, must be an unqualified gift, but for every American dollar used in child-feeding, the governments and communities aided furnish two dollars in the form of transportation, rent, labor, clerical help, cash contributions and such food supplies as are locally obtainable.

America has not failed in the past in great-heartedness. She has never had a more poignant call than this. Contributions should be turned over to the local committees which are now being formed for this national collection, or sent to Franklin K. Lane, Treasurer, Guaranty Trust Co., New York City.

(Signed)
American Relief Administration, by Herbert Hoover.
American Red Cross, by Livingston Farrand.
American Friends Service Committee (Quakers), by Wilbur K. Thomas.
Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, by Felix Warburg.
Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, by Arthur J. Brown.
Knights of Columbus, by James Flaherty.
Y. M. C. A., by C. V. Hibbard, International Committee.
Y. W. C. A., by Miss Mabel Cratty, National Board.

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK